



Interview Summary

Application No.
09/224,211

Applicant(s)
Jack Wassom et al.

Examiner
Tadesse Hailu

Art Unit
2173

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tadesse Hailu

(3) Karl Renner

(2) Scott R. Boalick (Applicant's Rep.)

(4) _____

Date of Interview Nov 5, 2002

RECEIVED

DEC 09 2002

Technology Center 2100

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal (copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed:

5,600,776 & WO 97/34388

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Just on the Amendment proposed
during the interview the combination of the
reference will be overcome.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Tadesse Hailu
Examiner's signature, if required